1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) United States Attorney 2 EUMI L. CHOI (WVSBN 0722) 3 Chief, Criminal Division 4 JEFFREY D. NEDROW (CSBN 161299) Assistant United States Attorney 5 150 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 900 6 San Jose, California 95113 (408) 535-5045 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff 8 9 MORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAN OA MARKINSAN IOCE PART 10 11 12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. 13 No. CR 05-70838-PVT 14 Plaintiff. [Proposed] ORDER GRANTING REQUEST TO CONTINUE 15 PRELIMINARY HEARING OR VS. **ARRAIGNMENT** DINA BAUTISTA, 16 a/k/a Rosa Maria Flores Nuno, 17 Defendant. 18 19 Upon stipulation of the parties in open court on December 8, 2005, and good cause 20 appearing, the Court finds as follows: 21 1. The United States of America, defendant Dina Bautista, and her attorney, Angela 22 Hansen, Esq., requested a continuance of the date set for preliminary hearing or indictment from 23 Thursday, December 8, 2005, to Thursday, January 12, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. 24 2. The parties stipulated that this continuance was necessary to give the parties adequate 25 time to attempt to resolve this matter, for the government to provide discovery, and for the 26 defense to meaningfully review the discovery and make a pre-charge decision regarding a 27 28 1

possible disposition in this matter.

- 3. The defendant was advised in open court, and acknowledged her understanding, that under Rule 5.1(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, she was entitled to a preliminary hearing within 10 days of her initial appearance unless an indictment is filed beforehand, and pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) she was entitled to be indicted within 30 days of her arrest in this matter. After consultation with her attorney, the defendant stated that she wished to waive those rights and continue the hearing set for preliminary hearing or indictment until January 12, 2006. The Court found that the defendant had provided a knowing and intelligent waiver of her rights as set forth above.
- 4. The court finds and the parties agreed that the ends of justice served by this continuance outweigh the interests of the defendant and the public in a speedy indictment and trial inasmuch as additional time was needed for the government to provide the defense with discovery, for the defendant to meaningfully review that discovery, and for the parties to fairly evaluate the possibility of a pre-charge resolution in this matter. Failure to grant the requested continuance would deny counsel for both parties the reasonable time necessary to for effective preparation regarding these decisions taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
- 5. Finally, the Court finds good cause to extend the time limits under Rule 5.1(c) pursuant to Rule 5.1(d). Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the date set for preliminary hearing or indictment is continued from Thursday, December 8, 2005, to Thursday, January 12, 2006.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the period of time from December 8, 2005 through and including January 12, 2006 shall be excluded from the time within which an indictment must be filed, for the reasons set forth above, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161 (h)((8)(A) considering the factors set forth in § 3161(h)(8)(B)(i) and (iv).

Dated this 4th day of January, 2006.

United States Magistrate Judge